



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Earle's.—Earle is undoubtedly right in saying that lines 44, 45 are a special case of “necessity is the mother of invention.” But the objections to his interpretation are: (1) substitution of $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\varsigma$ for $\zeta\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$; (2) inferiority of reason. The expression, “*even* misfortunes are a source of counsels,” does not emphasize the reason for the appeal with the same significance as “misfortunes are *actually the keenest* of counsels.” But Earle is no longer off the rails, like his predecessors. The main point was to insist on the correct interpretation of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \xi\nu\mu\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, which he has done. The rest will follow, if the final solution is yet to come.

F. T. RICKARDS

BOMBAY

THE THEORY OF IAMBIC SHORTENING IN LINDSAY'S *CAPTIVI*

When I read Lindsay's admirable edition of the *Captivi* of Plautus five years or more ago, I found myself involved in the meshes of a logical dilemma from which I could not escape. At the time I hoped for some elucidation of the difficulty in the subsequent writings of the author himself. But no light has come from him, and the fundamental question which disturbed me does not seem to have troubled the numerous reviewers who have properly spoken of the book in the highest terms of praise. I seem forced, therefore, to make open confession here, for the matter involved underlies the most important topic treated in the work. Let me state the points of difficulty in the order in which they presented themselves to me on reading the book.

Ninety of the one hundred and two pages of the Introduction are devoted to a discussion of the metre and prosody of Plautus, and a large number of these pages deal with the *brevis brevis* law and its ramifications. The principle itself is well stated at p. 30 in the following form: “After a short syllable an unaccented syllable, long by nature or by ‘position,’ was pronounced ‘half-long’ and scanned by the Dramatists either long or short, when the accent fell on the following syllable or on the preceding (short) syllable.” Most Plautine scholars hold, I presume, that if the short syllable of the iambic combination be under the ictus or the word (or sentence) accent, the conditions of the case are satisfied, and the long syllable of the iambus may be shortened. But this view of the case is vigorously and repeatedly combated by Lindsay, who remarks at p. 38 that “to ascribe to the mere incidence of the ictus or beat of the line any influence over the quantity of a syllable is surely unreasonable.” In the footnote at p. 31 he says: “This strange idea that the beat of a line, the cadence marked by the conductor's baton, could alter the quantity of a vowel of a Latin word has led to some surprising attempts at

scansion in Plautus, etc.;" and at p. 39 the same view is developed at some length. Now, a stress of voice has a tendency to affect the pronunciation of an adjacent syllable—a tendency which becomes effective under certain circumstances. But if, as Lindsay says, "the incidence of the ictus has no influence over the quantity of a syllable," even when an iambus is concerned, it seems to follow logically that the *incidence of the metrical ictus involves no stress of voice*. One might, indeed, hold that the constant incidence in everyday conversation of the word-accent on the first syllable of *bene* or *male*, for instance, would reduce the quantity of the final syllable, but that the occasional incidence of a metrical stress would not have that effect. Yet, as we have seen, this is not the theory advocated in the book. The verse-beat is regarded as a thing of such a nature that it can have no influence on the quantity of a syllable, and the inevitable conclusion drawn from the Introduction seems to be that the *word-accent and the metrical ictus are essentially different in character*.

The Appendix in this edition of the *Captivi* deals mainly with the question of the relation between the ictus and word-accent in Plautus. It was the perusal of this part of the book, after I had read the Introduction, which disturbed me, because the author speaks of the attempt of Latin verse-writers to "reconcile the natural stress-accent of the words with the ictus or metrical beat of the line" (p. 360). At p. 374 he quotes the Latin grammarians, apparently with approval, "who seem to speak of the lines of Plautus and Terence as if ictus and accent were very much the same thing." The occasional conflict between the metrical ictus and word-accent in Latin verse is compared at p. 373 to the not infrequent lack of harmony between the ictus and word-accent in English poetry. In our own poetry the ictus or verse accent is, of course, a stress of voice, and the conclusion to be drawn from this comparison and from the other quoted statements seems to be that *the Latin ictus was a stress of voice*. This conception of the ictus finds expression even in the Introduction in the statement that "to follow the Greek practice would bring the metrical ictus into constant clash with the natural accent." Only things which are alike in character can clash. And what is meant by the "natural accent," unless it is the stress which a given syllable *always* has, whether in everyday life or in literature, in prose or in verse, as opposed to the stress which another syllable has *on comparatively rare occasions*, viz., under the ictus in a verse? Were it not for the well-known views on the word accent which Lindsay has stated in his *Latin Language*, it might be supposed that he belonged to the French school of phoneticians, and that he regarded the word-accent and the ictus as similar in character, but as something else than a stress of voice; but, of course, this assumption cannot be made in his case. In the Appendix,

therefore, *the word-accent and the metrical ictus are thought of as similar in character*. In other words, I see no escape from the conclusion that Professor Lindsay treats the ictus as a stress of voice in the Appendix, and denies it that character in the Introduction.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

REJOINDER

Professor Abbott's difficulty is due, I think, to his belief (not the general belief, surely) that the ictus of verse and the emphasis of syllables in talk are one and the same thing; that, for example, a Roman reader uttered the first and third syllables of the hexameter line-opening *Maecenas dixit* with precisely the same stress as he uttered the first and third syllables of the sentence *me, non te, dixit*. Samuel Lover in his Irish novel *Handy Andy* gives an amusing description of the "sing-song" produced by confusing metrical ictus with accentual stress.

But I do not wish my theory of Plautine prosody to depend on this or that view of the nature of metrical ictus. The theory I state in these terms: The scansion of words in a line of Plautus reflects their pronunciation in ordinary (unpoetical) utterance. If, as everyone allows, a Roman pronounced the second syllable of *venire* long in the sentence *venire saluum te gaudeo*, then Plautus could not put *venire* at the beginning of a trochaic line. So the traditional opening of *Truc.* 504 *venire saluom* cannot be tolerated, if the line is, like the rest of the passage, trochaic.

W. M. LINDSAY

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS
Scotland

NOTES ON SOME ΚΙΟΝΙΣΚΟΙ IN ATHENS

When in Athens in 1903 I took occasion to examine the *κιονίσκοι* which lie near the Dipylon gate and which have been published in the *Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική*, 1893, pp. 221-24. My study revealed the following errors in the publication by Mylonas: p. 221, No. 2, after *Σωκλέους* the third line, containing the word *Ἀνδρία*, is omitted; p. 221, No. 3, read *Καρυσσία*; p. 223, No. 15, read *Ἀμισσηγή* for *Ἀμισσηγία*; No. 15 is like No. 16 except for the first word, which is *Εὐτέπη* instead of *Εὐτέρπη*; p. 223, No. 19, l. 3, the stone reads *Κυρηναῖος* and not *Μυρηναῖος*.

DAVID M. ROBINSON

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY